II. Amendments to the Drawings

Please replace sheet 1 of the drawings with replacement sheet 1 including amended Figure 1. The figures have been amended to include reference numerals 106, 112, 128, 132, 134, 150, and 152 in accordance with the examiner's suggestions.

Attorney Docket No. 10541-014

Appln. No. 10/036,922

III. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the

above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully

requested.

Claims 1-30 remain pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

The examiner indicated claim 3 was objected to as being dependent

upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent

form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening

claims.

Drawing Objections

Figure 1 has been amended to include reference numbers 106, 112,

128, 132, 134, 150, and 152 that were noted as missing by the examiner.

Claim Objections

Claim 28 has been amended to depend from claim 27 as noted by the

examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a data processing apparatus

configured for operation in conjunction with an external computer, the external

BRINKS HOFER GILSON &LIONE

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE PO Box 10395

Chicago, IL 60610

13

Attorney Docket No. 10541-014

Appln. No. 10/036,922

computer selectively originating a ready control signal", clarifying that "originating a ready control signal" modifies the external computer.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite "the external computer being configured to provide a ready control signal to the connector" to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13-15, 25, and 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikiya in view of US 2002/0154605A1 to Preston.

The Applicant respectfully submits the attached Declaration of the Dana B. Fecher under 37 C.F.R. §1.131, which evidences the conception of the claimed invention prior to April 24, 2001 (the 102(e) date of the Preston reference) and diligence from a date prior to April 24, 2001 to the filing of the instant application. The applicant respectfully submits that the Preston reference is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, and therefore cannot form the basis for a §103(a) rejection.

Claims 2, 8, 16-20, 26, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikiya in view of Preston.

Since the Preston reference is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, it cannot form the basis of a §103(a) rejection, as noted above.

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE PO Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610

Attorney Docket No. 10541-014

Appln. No. 10/036,922

With respect to claims 8 and 16, applicant traverses the examiner's

assertion of official notice, in that at the time of the invention the satellite

phone in the context of the claims and other limitations contained therein

would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention.

Claims 5, 10-12, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over Mikiya in view of Preston and further in view of

EIA/ITA 232 standard.

As noted above, the Preston reference is not prior art under 35 U.S.C.

§102, and therefore cannot form the basis of a rejection under §103(a). In

addition, the EIA/ITA 232 standard does not teach the limitations noted by the

examiner in Preston.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner

reconsider and withdraw the rejections under §103.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully

submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable

HOFER GILSON &LIONE BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE PO Box 10395

Chicago, IL 60610

15

over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: <u>January 11, 2006</u>

Robert K. Fergan Reg. No.: 51,674

Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610 (734) 302-6000